

New York Tribune
First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements
Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations
THURSDAY, AUGUST 12, 1920.

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Co., a New York corporation, office, 134 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. Editor: G. Verner Rogers, Vice-President; Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary; J. E. Maxwell, Treasurer. Address: Tribune Building, 134 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Room 2000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By mail, including postage, in the United States:
One year, \$12.00; Six months, \$7.00; Three months, \$4.00; One month, \$1.50.
By carrier, in New York City:
One year, \$13.00; Six months, \$8.00; Three months, \$4.50; One month, \$1.75.
Outside the United States:
One year, \$15.00; Six months, \$9.00; Three months, \$5.00; One month, \$2.00.
Single copies, 5 cents.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

GUARANTY
You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety. If it is defective, the results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news of spontaneous origin published here.

Russia's Border States
The reasons given by the President for refusing to recognize or to have any relations with the Bolshevik power are sound and satisfactory. It is, as he says, a brutal and tyrannical minority which seized the machinery of government by force, has maintained itself by savage oppression and boasts that "it will make agreements but will not be bound by them." It gives The Tribune great pleasure to be in hearty sympathy with the President concerning a fundamental moral question.

But believers in national rights and the principle of self-determination will scarcely give similar sweeping approval to the President's policy with respect to Russia's border states. Decision concerning the destiny of these peoples which Russia conquered, but only partly Russianified, he contends, must be deferred until such time as Russia has a responsible government and the voice of the Russian people can be heard. But what Russia is to be heard? All the Russias, acting singly, or only a preponderant Central Russia?

To permit Central Russia to decide is tantamount to declaring the border states are not to have national freedom. True, theoretically, they may not be denied the right to express themselves, but practically, if the consent of Central Russia must be obtained, then separation is most unlikely. Few nations, whether democratic or autocratic in government, have reached the height of a willingness to haul down flags.

When nationalism comes into existence cannot be defined with mathematical precision, any more than it can be said when a rivulet becomes a river or a lake a sea. But what consideration urged by Czechoslovakia cannot be urged by Lithuania? That the border states wish to break away from Russia is fairly established. If you have doubt ask any Lithuanian or Lett you meet in this country.

The necessity of some sort of judgment in advance of the establishment of a representative government at Moscow or Petrograd seems unescapable. To try to hold the question in nominal abeyance and at the same time not to oppose the occupation of the disputed territories during the abeyance period is to give judgment against the independence of the border states.

The logic of the situation seems to require at least a provisional recognition of the independence of the border states. Then, in the future, their peoples can pass on the question of reunion with Great Russia. They cannot coerce their big neighbor, whereas their big neighbor can, and probably will, coerce them if it has a chance. The sound ethics of this position is not weakened by the practical argument that it is much in the interest of general peace to have some sort of bulwark against Central Russia while the Bolsheviks control there.

It's There
A reader of The Tribune asks whether or not the San Francisco platform refers to the tariff, and if it does whether it reiterates the revenue-only principle.

Yes, our old acquaintance has returned—tucked away in an obscure corner, but there. He was ignored in 1916, but he is back garmented in the following language:

"We reaffirm the traditional policy of the Democratic party in favor of a tariff for revenue only."

During the European conflict, when protection was not needed because of the disorganization of foreign industry, President Wilson was a pretty good protectionist. He induced a Democratic Congress to pass a protective anti-dumping law; held import industries, such as the chemical one, should be encouraged by heavy duties, and advised that steps at once be taken to preserve in the post-war period the home market for American workers.

But it's different now; with imports mounting, we must not protect. Yet the total imports for the first six months of 1920 were \$2,870,000,000 in value, and promise to be \$6,000,000,000 for the year, or

nearly double the imports of any prior year. Yet the tariff is to be for revenue only.

When the war came to Europe this country, as the business world generally recognized, was headed for an industrial crash. The Underwood tariff went into effect on October 3, 1913, and in the beginning of 1914 its effects began to show. For six months the tide of imports rapidly rose, and incidentally American factories began to close. Is there doubt of what would have happened if Europe had not been compelled to turn to the making of war supplies?

The tariff question is now little discussed. But men of foresight, who study signs, are making guesses as to what will happen here when Europe reaches the full production toward which she is swiftly moving.

The Judicial Nominations
In recommending for renomination Justices Erlanger, Giegericht, Guy and Platzek, Democrats, and Ford, an independent Republican, the Republican committee has followed the practice of not opposing a sitting justice if of fairly good record. The same rule was applied to Judges Crain, Democrat, and Rosalsky, Republican, of the Court of General Sessions. The rule worked against the Republicans this time, but it is to the credit of the committee that it did not flinch.

For the other places on the ticket, where there are vacancies or appointments to fill vacancies by the Governor, the committees of both parties coincide in making differing recommendations. It will be agreed by all citizens, without regard to party, that the Republican committee has submitted an exceptionally meritorious list. Messrs. Isidor Wasservogel, James O'Malley, Robert McCall, Marsh and Henry K. Davis (if the recommendation in regard to him is confirmed in the Bronx) are all men of high character and professional attainment.

Those examining the Tammany recommendation are challenged by the name of District Attorney Swann, which Charles F. Murphy unexpectedly drew out of his pocket. The surmise is heard that the reason for the recommendation is that Tammany wishes to kick the District Attorney upstairs and to have control of his office during the eighteen months he has yet to serve. In the war between the House of Murphy and the House of Hearst Mr. Swann has been too much a Hearst errand boy. In the proceedings relating to the investigation of an "overshadowing crime" he has been most eager in his superserviceableness, and Tammany may naturally fear it may have a burden to carry in a more important campaign. "If he so loves Hearst, let Hearst elect him as judge. We provide the opportunity."

So the whisper is said to pass in Fourteenth Street circles. Perhaps this is good Tammany reasoning, but where does the public get off if Mr. Swann is elected in the hurly-burly of a Presidential contest?

News Out of Russia
In a special article, whose immense bulk implies industrious research, "The New Republic" reviews and summarizes some of the dispatches concerning Russia, which have appeared in "The New York Times." The apparent object is to convict "The Times" of misleading American public opinion, and as dispatches of similar tenor appeared in practically all American newspapers, to convict the American press generally of this offense.

The method adopted by the investigator is singular. He excludes from consideration the merits and demerits of the Soviet government, how it worked in practice, what effect its dominance had on the welfare of the Russian people, how it insensibly changed from a communist experiment to a despotic personal or group tyranny, and how, to keep power, its leaders adopted the nationalistic and imperialistic policy of the Czars.

The investigator, moreover, does not regard as germane to his task information as to the extent of the Red Terror. The inquiry is practically narrowed to the single point of whether the dispatches accurately predicted the course of military events in Russia and foreshadowed the establishment of the Bolshevik power.

To this end the dispatches are classified as "optimistic" or "pessimistic"—that is, from the standpoint of the Allies. They fall into the former classification when speaking favorably of the chances of Kerensky, of Korniloff, of Kolchak, of Denikine, of Yudenitch, of the Poles, or of an early collapse of Bolshevism. They are in the other list if they foretell Bolshevik military victories. So limited, the review, of course, shows that the dispatch writers, when their words are examined in the light of events, were commonly wrong.

No one has been able to formulate an altogether satisfactory definition of news. What is rated important by one man is not so rated by another. So it is inevitable for many to complain of the judgment of newspaper editors. But though there is no agreement as to what news is, there is general agreement as to what it is not.

It is not prophecy. News deals with the present and the immediate past, and little with the future. Its

raw material consists of events that have occurred. The newsmen who becomes a prophet fails as prophets generally do. But when prediction is plainly presented as such no particular harm is done, for the sensible reader discounts its value and is not deceived.

"The New Republic" shows the dispatch writers of "The Times" were poor prophets. That's all. Otherwise, as is now clear, the news from Russia, allowing reasonably for exaggeration, has painted a correct picture. As to the big matter, the truth has been told. This big matter relates to how the Bolshevik régime has worked. An experiment long talked of was launched, and the world needed to know how it fared and how fared the Russian people under it. As to the result, there is now no more basis for doubt than there is for doubt that the Bolshevik group has successfully consolidated, for the present at least, an autocratic military power.

A World in the Dumps
It is too much to hope things to go right in a week like this, and the home run fans of America might have known that something would happen to their hero, the most valuable mountain of flesh in the universe. "The time is out of joint," said Hamlet, most understanding of all glooms, some years back; and here, in the midst of cruciating toward a pennant, "Babe" Ruth dislocates his knee sliding to second. By such mischances are dynasties and pennants lost and won.

The only silver lining we can discern lines the hat of that youngster whose father personally conducted him in the wake of the Yankees with the understanding that they were not to return home until "Babe" had knocked a home run. If the bet is not off—and it is the way of grown-ups, we regret to say, to read convenient terms and exceptions into promises of this nature—this young man has a pleasant holiday ahead that may run into weeks and take the pursuit of a home run into many states and cities.

For the rest of the universe we can see nothing better than to concede the week to fate and hope for a better seven days to come. This is not to counsel knuckling under to bad luck. The idea is rather to chuckle at the old gloom's cunning and neatness of execution, and, giving him his due, make ready for a fitting retort. A sense of humor is not at all incompatible with a scrappy come-back. In fact, a fighting grin is about the worst enemy the dumps can face. Try one and see.

The Dominican Business
A dispatch from Montevideo, Uruguay, following on one of similar contents from Havana, is to the effect that an appeal has been forwarded to President Wilson in behalf of Fabio Fallio, described as "a patriot poet," and now on trial before a United States court martial at San Domingo. Fallio is said to face a possible infliction of the death penalty on a charge of having violated the censorship decreed by an American military commander.

One of the non-understandable mysteries concerning the Administration relates to the autocratic government which has been set up in San Domingo by force. The American people have not been consulted, or even informed, as to its justification. The officers of a loyally constituted government, against which no complaint is lodged, have been chased out of the island. Travelers report that the Dominican Congress is not allowed to assemble; that election is permitted, and that even the Dominican courts are not allowed to sit. There are rumors of the application of the "water cure," and although these rumors be baseless, it is admitted that for a long period the Dominicans have been denied every trace of self-rule.

How the Administration reconciles these acts with the principle that it upholds elsewhere is not explained. There is no defense or denial—only silence. Yet the San Domingo business, news of which is leaking out, is compromising our good repute in Latin-American countries. In times past Latin America has been exceedingly suspicious of our motives, but happily, basis for suspicion has not existed. But what is the American in Latin America to say who is asked questions about San Domingo?

Obliterating the Blonde
Are blondes to become extinct? This question jostles its big brothers, the world problems. It is said the number of blondes is rapidly diminishing, no reason being given. To hold that it is a freak of fashion will not satisfy the social philosopher. Fashion can do much for women—it can change the complexion as well as the figure—but artificial blondes cannot content the lovers of blue eyes and yellow hair.

We are now told again that the brunette "is coming into her own." Has she not had her own all along? Styles in hats are to work this miracle. The colors for the fall season will be copper, ochre and cochin, all of which favor the dark beauty. It is hard measure for the blonde. Must she dye her hair to be fashionable? No statistics are needed to enforce the conclusion that the brunette has long been getting the better of it. This is the work not of art,

but of nature, and nature moves in a mysterious way her wonders to perform. In her fury against the blonde she requires no assistance. And what, pray, can mere man do about it? Only, if he happens to admire the blonde the more, lament the passing of an ideal.

"There are hats," it is said, "which can make the lank girl look sweet and luringly plump and the fat, padded type look willowy." Who doubts it? Insatiable fashion, cannot one such triumph suffice? Why persecute the hapless blonde?

Piffle! Bunk!
Whereby a Sinn Feiner Replies to an Editorial

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I quote the following from a recent editorial in The Tribune:
"That has come to pass which was foreseen would certainly come to pass when a large number of persons in Ireland adopted the view that, while the sacred right of self-determination entitled Ireland to insist on separation from Great Britain, it did not give Ulster the right to determine to remain with England. Those in America who have seen fit to encourage a movement which in the same breath declares it demands freedom and in the next that freedom shall not be accorded to a large and important Irish minority, which largely lives apart, may reflect further on the responsibility they assume."

Of course, this is bunk. And, of course, the man who wrote it knew it was bunk.
Is there any community in the civilized world where a small minority is permitted to dominate the majority? During our own Revolutionary War our American Tories wanted "freedom" to remain with England. Were they permitted to impose their will upon the great majority, who favored separation from England? Our Southern Confederacy also wanted "freedom." Was it permitted to have it? The argument that one-fifth of the people of Ireland should be permitted to dominate the other four-fifths is such preposterous piffle that it is astonishing to see a paper of the standing of The New York Tribune permitting its columns to be disfigured with it.

Let us recast the above quotation so as to make it apply to the American colonies:

"That has come to pass which was foreseen would certainly come to pass when a large number of persons in America adopted the view that, while the sacred right of self-determination entitled America to insist on separation from Great Britain, it did not give the Loyalists of America the right to determine to remain with England. Those in England who have seen fit to encourage a movement which in the same breath declares it demands freedom and in the next that freedom shall not be accorded to a large and important American minority which largely lives apart, may reflect further on the responsibility which they assume."

Now, what do you think of it?
And, by the way, does the editor of The Tribune not know that the Ulstermen in the north-east corner of Ireland are not Irish at all, but merely the descendants of the Scotch and English carpetbaggers who were planted there by William III after he had stolen these lands and driven the rightful owners into exile?
SINN FEIN.
St. Louis, Mo., Aug. 7, 1920.

The Republic of Ireland
To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Messrs. Buchanan and Julian are like the first American soldiers captured by the Germans, who when asked why America was fighting Germany stated they did not know.

My prime object in the war was in conformity with the first principles of our philosophy of government, "Might does not make right."
Mindful of consistency, we acted with the courage of our convictions upon the establishment of the various South American republics. We forestalled Europe supporting an emperor in Mexico, and even resorted to the last recourse to free Cuba.

From the Orient west to Canada the subject nations of England are on the eve of self-emancipation, so let the timid mental slacker take heart and the Anglomaniac be silent.

War with the United States would hasten the crash of British imperialism, and England, knowing that, would exercise self-control if we followed out our traditional policy of encouraging republicanism by recognizing the republic of Ireland.

Thanks on Behalf of Soldier
To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: May I use your columns again to thank the men and women who have responded so instantly and generously to my appeal for magazines for a young and gallant war shattered soldier?

Beyond the immediate relief lies the hope of something more permanent and revivifying, which is what I had also wished to elicit; some definite and prolonged assistance. I am very grateful and I am begging the privilege of, from time to time, seeking aid through your valuable paper for these distressing cases as I meet with or hear of them through my volunteer work at the War Community Service booths.

A Costly Heart
(From The Philadelphia Inquirer)
A poor quality of Mexican sugar, indifferently refined, is selling for 23 cents a pound, and the public is glad to get it. It is a nice commentary on the negligence shown toward domestic affairs in order to devote time to binding up the heart of the world, when we consider that we might now be buying the best market affords at 11 or 12 cents a pound had the President done his duty.

A Fictitious Bulwark

Why Hungary Cannot Help Stem the Tide of Bolshevism

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Under the title "A Fictitious Bulwark," an article was printed in your issue of August 2. As one who knows Hungary and her political life, as well as the mind of her political leaders, I was deeply pleased with the clearness and accuracy with which your editorial presented the actual situation of that country. Indeed, after reading the high sounding statements of Count Teleki, of Admiral Horthy and of their associates, one acquainted with the real conditions has the impression that they either do not know what their statements contain, or—and this seems to be the case—something else is being concealed behind the words.

To assert that the help of Hungary in the fight against Bolshevism is of vital importance for the issue of this struggle means to forget that country's situation and the forces she can dispose of. Between the Hungarian territory and the realm of the Soviets there are in the northeast Czechoslovakia and Poland (Galicia) and in the east the whole of Rumania. The Czechoslovak republic has a population of 12,000,000, Rumania has a population of 17,000,000, while Hungary scarcely has 9,000,000 inhabitants. If a military intervention will be decided upon by the Allies, the great help will be given by Rumania and Czechoslovakia. Neither is Hungary in danger of being invaded; this event would happen only in case Czechoslovakia and especially Rumania are crushed by the Bolshevik armies.

The real purpose of these statements given by the statesmen of Budapest has nothing to do with Bolshevism. According to the peace treaty Hungary is obliged to reduce her army to a standing of 35,000 men. The Hungarian politicians repeatedly declared that they will fight to reconquer the territories lost to Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Jugo-Slavia. This means that they think of a war of revenge as soon as opportunity comes. This is why they try under every pretext possible to postpone the reduction of their army, waiting, amid eventual new complications, for the right moment to invade again Rumanian and Czechoslovak territory. How idle and foolish this idea may be, it proves the existence of a political direction we have to reckon with, all the more as in the last time Hungarian patrols at several points of the Rumanian border opened fire on our frontier guards.

It does not seem very serious in these circumstances to emphasize continuously that the troops of the Hungarian white terrier will be the saviors of the world, as the Hungarian nobility are presenting the case. Besides Hungary has too much to do at home, where innocent people are being massacred, the democratic movement crushed, and from where, on account of the terror, all sound minded democratic leaders were forced to flee to Vienna.

The propaganda from Budapest is in accordance with the statements circulated in this country by Charles Huszar, late Premier of the terrorist government of Hungary, who, the other day, also from the columns of a New York newspaper, attacked Rumania with calumnies and pleaded again for the "territorial integrity" of former Hungary.

Far from being a bulwark to Bolshevism, Hungary, by her overzealous army, led by dangerous political ideas, only menaces her neighbors and makes it impossible for Rumania to array her full strength against the Bolshevik flood.
BASIL STOICA,
Commissioner of the Rumanian Government.
New York, Aug. 10, 1920.

Absurd Philippine Reports

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: With respect to some correspondence that is being sent to the American papers from the Philippines regarding the protests of the people of the islands against the extension of the United States constative law to the Philippines, allow me to quote for your and your readers' information the following official cable received from the Secretary of Commerce and Communications of the Philippine Islands and transmitted to Mr. Fidel A. Reyes, Director of the Bureau of Commerce and Industry of the Philippine government, by the Bureau of Insular Affairs, United States War Department:

"Referring to telegram from you of the 2d instant regarding sensational reports transmitted to the New York papers from Manila as to the possibility of real trouble in the Philippine Islands through the passage of the United States constative shipping law, you are right in branding them as absurd and ridiculous. While the sentiment of the Filipino people is unanimous against the extension of this law to the islands, it being considered prejudicial to their interests, meetings and deliberations are held in the most peaceful manner and not conducted as a movement against the United States government or the American people, to whom time and again we have shown our loyalty. The Filipinos are simply making use of their constitutional right to peacefully assemble and petition the constituted authorities for legal redress to exclude the Philippine Islands from the operation of this law.—Dionizio Jakosalem." ARSENIO N. LUZ,
Mgr. Philippine Commercial Agency.
New York, Aug. 10, 1920.

Letting the World Alone

(From The Kansas City Journal)
Mr. Harding does not fear that the failures of any of his plans or policies will "break the world's heart." In the first place, his plans and policies are all American and the world is not immediately concerned in them, and then he is not reaching out in perspective to entangle this government in the world's affairs; he isn't even contemplating the visit of several months to Europe when he becomes President.

The Bitter-Enders

(From The Dallas Morning News)
The Turks have decided to sign the peace treaty. But the Irish are still holding out.

EVEN THEIR NEAREST RELATIVES ARE DESERTING THEM



The Polish Crisis

By Frank H. Simonds

The collapse of Poland has brought the Allied world to a crisis in all respects like to that of the spring of 1918, when divided command and hesitating policies all but lost the World War. In March the German blow dissipated all the mistaken notions and retarding prejudices. It was no longer possible in the presence of the forward rush of German troops toward Amiens to pursue their old familiar debates as to whether the war was to be won in the East or the West, and to what degree unity of command should prevail.

It was apparent instantly to the blindest that the question was purely and simply whether the war was to be lost in the West. It is now a question as to whether Bolshevism is to be checked at the Oder, the Elbe or the Rhine—whether the Allies of yesterday will fight the battle away from their frontiers or within them.

War Inescapable

And it is essential beyond all else to establish the fact that it is war, and a war which is inescapable. We, the Western nations, may make peace with the Bolsheviks, but we cannot compel them to make peace or expect them, even if they should agree to a truce, to observe it. Bolshevism is war against that form of social and economic organization which is ours, which is the Western system. If it falls all falls, which we know; but if it is to survive it must be fought for.

Poland Had to Fight

It is fashionable to charge the Polish collapse to Polish imperialistic purposes, but this is quite inaccurate. The Bolsheviks proposed peace with Poland more than a year ago, and the Paris Conference forbade Poland to make such a peace. To be sure, the peace would have been but the prelude to Bolshevik conquest, but, being unable to make peace, Poland had no choice but to fight, and the obligation imposed upon the Allies, who forbade the making of peace, was to support Poland.

Instead, Poland was suffered to embark upon a great military campaign without adequate resources. Compelled to fight, she went after her foe before that foe reached her own indefensible boundaries fixed by the Paris Conference. The offensive was ill-conceived, badly executed, to be criticized on the military side without reservation, but the fact is not to be criticized. Poland had to fight—the Western nations insisted upon it. Her defeat is their defeat; her destruction to be laid to their door, and, unless Poland is restored, the alliance of the Western nations becomes a mere mockery.

The Old German Danger

And only by the sending of Allied troops can the permanent destruction of Poland be prevented. To debate further the question of negotiations with the Bolsheviks is to fall into all the old errors which cost so much during the German war. If Poland is lost

the victory will be lost, and we shall have the old German danger and a new and even more terrible Russian menace to face. But we did not conquer Germany by words, nor while we relied upon words. We shall not out-debate Lenin and Trotsky nor paralyze their armies by conversations.

As Critical as the Marne

The present hour is as critical for our civilization as that, six years ago this month, when the German hosts, victorious in the battles of the frontiers in France and Belgium, rushed down toward the Marne. If it is not faced we shall lose the larger benefit of the Marne victory, of the triumph in the World War, and presently be forced to fight at a great disadvantage, for fight we shall have to in the end. Willy nilly, we are again at war, the United States quite as much as France or Britain.

A Notable Figure

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: In the sudden death of the Rev. George F. Pentecost, D. D., pastor of Bethany Presbyterian Church, of Philadelphia (the Wanamaker church), there ended the career of one of the most remarkable men of a generation now passed. He was a powerful and original preacher and an author of books which thirty years ago had a great circulation. Intimate friend of Moody, Spurgeon and, indeed, all of the foremost men of his day, he had led a characteristically American career.

Born in Illinois seventy-nine years ago, when it was a raw frontier of the West, the Civil War found him a robust, courageous, energetic lad, and he joined the Union army, serving in Kentucky. With the end of the war he went to Kansas as secretary to the territorial Governor. Here he came into personal touch with men of national reputation of fifty years ago, and there was predicted for him a brilliant career.

Just then he was converted and became pastor of a Baptist church in Kentucky. The churches served by him in Boston, Brooklyn and London invariably experienced a remarkable growth, and the years have proved the solidity of his work, for they are still great churches. Inas much as a worker, he remained in harness, when by reason of advanced years he could well have retired.

His last pastorate was marked by all the tokens characteristic of his work. His sermons had all the old tenderness and power, and in association with John Wadsworth, the famous Bethany Presbyterian Church took on its oldtime vigor and spirituality.

He had planned to be on his way to Japan as a delegate to the International Sunday School Convention, to be held in Tokio in September, when death overtook him.

With him has passed away a notable figure among a fast diminishing number of great ministers of the past generation.

C. I. SCOFIELD,
Douglaston Park, N. Y., Aug. 10, 1920.

Well Named

(From The St. Paul Pioneer Press)
The organizers of the Farmer-Labor party are willing, even anxious, that the farmer labor so long as he doesn't ask them to help. Also they are willing and anxious that the farmer turn over a liberal share of his earnings to them for "campaign purposes."